



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
01/25/2001	David S. Matthews	XXT-108	5475	
7590 11/16/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Patrick R Roche			GRANT II, JEROME	
Fay Sharpe Fagan Minnich & McKee LLP			PAPER NUMBER	
1100 Superior Avenue 7th Floor Cleveland, OH 44114-2518		2626	- THER HOMBER	
	01/25/2001 690 11/16/2005 he an Minnich & McKee LLP Avenue 7th Floor	01/25/2001 David S. Matthews  11/16/2005  he an Minnich & McKee LLP  Avenue 7th Floor	01/25/2001 David S. Matthews XXT-108  90 11/16/2005 EXAM he GRANT II, an Minnich & McKee LLP Avenue 7th Floor ART UNIT	

DATÉ MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<del></del>	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	·	09/769,926	MATTHEWS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Jerome Grant II	2626		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app				
Period for	· •				
WHI( - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply b vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Se	eptember 2005.			
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)□					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims		•		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>17-20</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>17-20</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the	ıe Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	•	` '		
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		•		
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Offi	ice Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Applic ity documents have been rece	cation No		
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not rece	ived.		
Attachment	c(s)		JERONIE GRANT II PRIMARY EXAMINER		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa	ary (PTO-413)		
3) 🔲 Inforn	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) · No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 2626

## **Detailed Action**

1.

## Rejections Under 112 First Par.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

While the information section 10 is referred to, the written specification does not adequately teach the hardware, elements or specific instructions for accomplishing the third limitations of claims 17 and 19.

The written specification is inadequate to teach an automatic detection of the size of the input image. Page 9, lines 25-30 suggests that the calculation is done manually.

Art Unit: 2626

The written specification does not adequately teach the 5 limitations of claim 17 and the fourth limitation of claim 19. Page, lines 15-20 of the specification suggests that the user intervenes to input data. There doesn't appear to be any automatic adjustments.

The written specification does not adequately teach reading an image document while preventing the reading of the white portions around the read image. There is inadequate disclosure. However, it appears that this limitation is well known according to applicant at col. 1, lines 30-32.

2.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakata in view of the well known prior art.

With respect to claims 17 and 19, Nakata teaches an image forming method comprising: receiving an input document on a scanning device via document feeder

Art Unit: 2626

500, scanning the original; receiving data regarding the size of the output document, as

supported at col. 11, lines 9-43; receiving user data (input unit 403) for inputting the

size of a document, see also, col. 10, lines 30-39; enlarging or reducing the input image

automatically, see col. 9, lines 12-22, col. 10, lines 15-20; and reproducing the image a

number of time, col. 9, lines 20-25.

What is not shown is scanning the image while not scanning the white portions

around the image.

However, this limitation, according to applicant, is that it is well known in the art.

Hence, it would have been obvious as a matter of design choice to combine the

document detection means, discussed in the prior art, for reading the original without

the white margins or null data for the purpose of accurately detecting the size of the

original.

With respect to claims 18 and 20, Nakata teaches the use of an electrophotographic

image scanner, according to figure 1.

3.

Art Unit: 2626

Examiner's Remarks

The examiner has reviewed applicant's comments, however, they are not persuasive

to overcome the 112 first para. Rejection.

At page 4, applicant argues that page 7, lines 1-14 and page 8, lines 6-24 teach the

third limitation of claim 17. However, this section of the specification does not recite, "

receiving user data... comprising the number of images to be reproduced..."

Applicant states that page 4, lines 4-6 further teaches the claimed limitation. However,

upon further view, this section of the specification is directed toward the Summary of the

Invention. This section of the specification explains what the invention is trying to solve

but it does not explain how the above claimed limitation will be realized. No structure

or interactions between different structures are set forth to explain the claimed feature.

Applicant argues the fifth limitation of claim 17 is addressed at page 9, lines 7-23.

However, this section of the specification does not address receiving any user input.

Although it mentions dimensions of received data, there is no teaching of "..receiving

user data concerning an output document, the user data comprising the number of

images to be reproduced...."

Art Unit: 2626

Applicant asserts that the examiner does not have a motivation to combine and has not established a prima facie case of obviousness.

The examiner is combining what is known and taught by Nakata and what is known and taught by applicant's specification.

At page 7, lines 30-34, the written specification states that it is well known to copy only the image portion without the border or null data.

Hence, the examiner was using as a rationale for the rejection a statement that applicant admitted is already known in the art. Hence, applicant's own statement provides prima facie case of obviousness in view of Nakata which also takes pictures of data to be magnified or reduced. It would have been obvious for Nakata to take a picture of the original without the margins or null data as suggested by applicant.

4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Grant II whose telephone number is 571-272-7463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 9:00 to 5:00.

Application/Control Number: 09/769,926 Page 7

Art Unit: 2626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams, can be reached on 571-272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Grant∕IÍ

JEROME GRANT II PRIMARY EXAMINER